

Spiritual Epistemology: A Critical Analysis of Religious Knowledge Theories in
Global Mystical Traditions (*A Comparative Philosophical Study*)

الإبستمولوجيا الروحية: تحليل نقدي لنظريات المعرفة الدينية

في التقاليد الصوفية العالمية "دراسة فلسفية مقارنة"



By D^R. Zakaria GHOBINI

Associate Professor of Islamic Culture and Educational Sciences,

University of El Oued, Algeria

*Official English Spokesperson for the international start-up "Cambridge BraineX" specializing in
research and innovation in AI and advanced technologies –*

United Kingdom/Algeria

zakaria-ghobrini@univ-eloued.dz

Submission date: 19/02/2025

Acceptance date: 02/12/2025

Publication date: 31/12/2025



Abstract:

- **Objectives:** This study asks when, how, and under what constraints mystical disclosures can count as knowledge rather than mere affect or construction. It addresses the impasse between perceptualist, reformed-epistemology, and constructivist accounts, arguing for a calibrated, cross-traditional framework that can assess claims without reductionism or credulity.
- **Method:** The research employs a triangulated design: (1) disciplined phenomenology and hermeneutics to secure descriptive fidelity; (2) comparative philosophical analysis of Sufi, Christian, Advaita, and Mahāyāna sources; (3) virtue-epistemic evaluation with explicit criteria—coherence, reliability-in-practice, intersubjective calibration, defeat-management, and transformative fruits.
- **Findings:** Mystical cognition can achieve knowledge-status on a graded model—Minimal Credibility, Qualified Warrant, Robust Knowledge—when criteria are jointly met and resilient to defeaters. Multiple traditions exhibit mature doxastic practices that satisfy these conditions, supporting a pluralist realism of parameterized disclosures rather than an anemic sameness.
- **Originality:** The study reconceives ineffability and mediation as parameters, not defeaters; operationalizes a graded, virtue-regulated model; codifies responsibility conditions; and reframes pluralism as aspectual complementarity. It recommends transparent defeat-protocols, mechanism-awareness, and comparative calibration for future research and formation.
- **Keywords:** spiritual epistemology; mystical knowledge; virtue epistemology; pluralism; comparative philosophy.

الملخص:

- أهداف البحث: يتساءل هذا البحث: متى وكيف وبأي ضوابط يمكن للانكشافات الصوفية أن تُعدّ معرفة لا مجرد أثر وجداني أو بناء ثقافي؟ يعالج تعارض النماذج الإدراكية والإصلاحية والبنائية، مقترحاً إطاراً مقارناً مُحكماً يوازن بين عدم الاختزال وتجنب السداجة.
- منهج الدراسة: اعتمدت الدراسة ثلاثية منهجية: (1) فينومينولوجيا وتأويلاً منضبطين لضبط الوصف؛ (2) تحليلاً فلسفياً مقارناً لمتون صوفية وإيمانية وأدفايتية ومهايانية؛ (3) تقويماً فضائلياً بمعايير صريحة: الاتساق، الاعتمادية الممارسة، المعايير بين الشهود، إدارة المبطلات، والثمار التحويلية.
- النتائج: يمكن للمعرفة الصوفية بلوغ مرتبة المعرفة وفق نموذج تدريجي—مصادقية دنيا، ضمانة مؤهلة، معرفة راسخة—عندما تتحقق المعايير مجتمعة وتثبت أمام المبطلات. تُظهر تقاليد متعددة ممارسات عقديّة ناضجة تستوفي ذلك، بما يدعم واقعية تعددية بفضاءات كشف مُعلّمة لا تماثلاً مفرغاً.
- أصالة البحث: يُعيد البحث صياغة اللامقوليّة والوساطة كمعاملات لا مُسقطات؛ ويُفعل نموذجاً تدريجياً منظماً بالفضائل؛ ويُقنّن شروط المسؤولية؛ ويقدم التعددية كتكامل جوانبي. ويوصي ببروتوكولات مبطلات شفافة، ووعي آلي بالآليات، ومعايرة مقارنة.
- كلمات مفتاحية: الإستمولوجيا الروحية؛ المعرفة الصوفية؛ فضائل العقل؛ التعددية؛ الفلسفة المقارنة.

Introduction:

Mystical traditions across civilizations—from Sufi, Eastern Christian hesychastic, and Kabbalistic lineages to Advaita Vedānta and Mahāyāna Buddhism—recurrently claim that ultimate reality discloses itself in ways that are at once transformative and authoritative. Yet the epistemic status of such disclosures remains contested. Are mystics perceiving a *sui generis* domain of truth, as classic “perceptual” models contend, or are they articulating culturally mediated interpretive constructions, as contextualist critics argue? The present study contends that a comprehensive spiritual epistemology must move beyond the stale binary of “private ineffability” versus “public warrant,” offering instead a multi-criteria account of mystical cognition that is phenomenologically exacting, philosophically rigorous, and cross-traditionally sensitive. The researcher argues that when mystical claims are situated within a comparative philosophical matrix and assessed by calibrated epistemic virtues (coherence, noetic depth, transformative fruitfulness, intersubjective convergences, defeasibility to criticism, and pragmatic reliability), they yield a defensible—though defeasible—form of knowledge irreducible to mere affect or

cultural construction. This thesis seeks to re-open the question of religious knowledge with methodological sobriety and conceptual boldness.

The problem has an illustrious intellectual genealogy. William James famously characterized mystical states as “noetic,” carrying an “authority” for the subject while eluding full propositional capture; his formulation remains seminal but under-theorized as epistemology.¹ Later analytic theists such as Alston and Plantinga reframed religious experience in terms of doxastic practices and proper basicity, challenging the demand that all religious beliefs derive from inferential evidence.² Yet strong contextualist objections—exemplified by Katz’s dictum that there is “no pure experience” unmediated by prior conceptual-linguistic frameworks—continue to problematize claims to cross-cultural epistemic parity.³ The researcher holds that both sides isolate real insights while missing a synthetic, graded conception of mystical cognition that acknowledges forms of mediation without collapsing into relativism. In this sense, the present study aims to renovate the field by advancing a carefully tiered model of mystical knowing that is simultaneously fallibilist and realist.

The urgency of this inquiry is twofold. First, within religious studies and philosophy of religion, the status of “religious experience” lies at the fault line between phenomenological description and epistemic justification.⁴ Second, in comparative theology and global philosophy, the question of whether putatively ultimate disclosures converge or diverge bears directly on pluralism, interreligious understanding, and the normative claims of traditions.⁵ From Ibn ʿArabī’s doctrine of unveiling (*kashf*) and *waḥdat al-wujūd* to Śaṅkara’s nondual insight (*aparokṣa-jñāna*) and the apophatic ascent of Pseudo-Dionysius and Gregory Palamas, the trans-cultural repertoire of methods and claims is rich enough to test any epistemic framework.⁶ The researcher emphasizes that a comparative approach is not a mere cataloguing exercise; it functions here as a stress test for epistemic criteria, revealing where theories succeed, fail, or require refinement.

1. Objectives:

1. To articulate a precise conceptual map of “spiritual epistemology,” distinguishing it from—but relating it to—religious experience, revelation, and metaphysical doctrine.
2. To evaluate leading theories of mystical knowledge: perceptual, doxastic-practice, reformed epistemology, constructivist/contextualist, neurocognitive, and pragmatic-virtue models.

3. To undertake close, textually grounded comparisons of paradigmatic mystical epistemes in Islamic Sufism, Christian mysticism, Jewish Kabbalah, Advaita Vedānta, and Mahāyāna Buddhism.
4. To propose an integrated, graded model of mystical knowing anchored in epistemic virtues and test it against cross-traditional primary sources and major objections.
5. To clarify the implications of this model for pluralism, normativity, and interreligious dialogue.

2. Methodology: The study employs a triangulated methodology,

- Comparative philosophical analysis: close reading and conceptual reconstruction of primary sources (e.g., al-Ghazālī's *al-Munqidh min al-ḥalāl*, Ibn ʿArabī's *Fuṭūḥ* and *Futūḥāt*, Teresa of Ávila's *Interior Castle*, Palamas's *Triads*, Maimonides' *Guide*, Śaṅkara's *Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya*, Nāgārjuna's *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*), evaluated with contemporary epistemology (e.g., Alston, Plantinga, Al-Ghazālī's internalist-externalist tensions).⁷
- Phenomenological and hermeneutic sensitivity: accounting for first-person claims without naïve immediatism; the researcher adopts critical phenomenology to preserve descriptive fidelity while applying defeaters and cross-checks.⁸
- Analytic rigor with virtue-epistemic accents: the researcher defends an approach that privileges reliability, coherence, transformative fruits, and intersubjective calibration over simplistic verificationism.

3. Originality and Contribution:

- The study advances a graded, multi-criteria model of mystical knowledge that mediates between realist and constructivist poles, offering a structured account of when and how mystical claims can count as knowledge.
- It operationalizes comparative philosophy as an epistemic stress test, not merely an exercise in typology.
- It reframes the relation between ineffability and propositionality: the researcher argues that non-propositional acquaintance can have propositional consequences under disciplined interpretive norms.
- It specifies defeat conditions (moral, cognitive, communal, and doctrinal) for mystical claims, thus integrating responsibility conditions typically absent in classical accounts.

4. Scope and Limitations:

The project centers on paradigmatic texts and representative practices; it does not claim exhaustive coverage of all mystical literatures. The researcher adopts a fallibilist stance: mystical knowledge is taken to be possible and sometimes actual, but always revisable in light of wider evidential and hermeneutic constraints.

Signposting the Study The work proceeds through five chapters, each with three sections. Each section will be drafted in approximately 650 words with embedded numbered citations and a consolidated reference list at the end of the section, as you requested. After each is delivered, the researcher will await your instruction before moving forward.

Chapter I:

Conceptual and Methodological Foundations:

1.1. Defining Spiritual Epistemology:

Concepts, Domains, and Distinctions: Spiritual epistemology designates a disciplined inquiry into when, how, and under what constraints putatively spiritual or mystical disclosures count as knowledge rather than affect, projection, or mere edification. It is narrower than a general philosophy of religion because it targets modes of knowing—acquaintance, perception, testimony, and inference—while remaining broader than any single tradition’s doctrinal schema, proceeding comparatively across religious cultures and analytically across conceptual frameworks. Michael Polanyi’s aphorism that “we can know more than we can tell” highlights the legitimacy of tacit and non-propositional cognition as genuine knowledge (10). The researcher agrees, while adding that acquaintance without articulation is epistemically incomplete; it must be responsibly “voiced” through disciplined interpretation, intersubjective scrutiny, and explicit vulnerability to defeat. To set the conceptual terrain, three domains of spiritual knowledge are distinguished. First, acquaintance-knowledge: immediate, non-inferential awareness of God, the Absolute, or emptiness. William James classically described mystical states as “states of insight into depths of truth unplumbed by the discursive intellect,” and as “noetic” in that they “carry with them a curious sense of authority” (11). The researcher acknowledges the evidential force of such authority for the subject, yet insists that felt authority is not final authority: the move from acquaintance to knowledge

requires criteria that outlast the experience—coherence, reliability, and critical resilience.

Second, interpretive-propositional knowledge: communities encode, contest, and refine putative disclosures into doctrines, commentaries, and philosophical theses. William Alston's account of "doxastic practices" shows how traditions stabilize procedures for forming and evaluating beliefs from religious experience (12). The researcher endorses this practice-centered lens as a way to render private experiences publicly assessable, but contends that any practice's outputs remain corrigible by internal coherence tests, cross-traditional dialogue, and defeaters (logical, moral, or empirical).

Third, practical-transformative knowledge: the long-range fruits of a putative disclosure in moral integrity, intellectual sobriety, and existential freedom. Alvin Plantinga's notion of properly basic belief secures space for non-inferential warrant in religious cognition, locating justification partly in the proper functioning of cognitive faculties in appropriate environments (13). The researcher agrees that such basicity can be real, yet argues that in plural settings "responsible basicity" requires ongoing calibration by communal disciplines, exposure to criticism, and a virtue-theoretic regulation of uptake.

Two structuring tensions require careful handling. The first concerns mediation. Steven Katz's constructivist thesis—"there are no pure (i.e., unmediated) experiences"—warns that perception and interpretation are always concept-laden (14). The researcher grants degrees of mediation but rejects the slide to relativism: as in the sciences, theory-ladenness does not eliminate world-directed reliability; it mandates methodological controls. The second tension concerns ineffability and propositional traction. Jean-Luc Marion's "saturated phenomena" name givenness that overwhelms conceptual grasp (15). The researcher concurs that mystical givenness can exceed articulation, yet contends that excess need not preclude constraint: disciplined hermeneutics can yield modest, testable claims that remain anchored in, though not exhausted by, the original acquaintance.

Methodologically, spiritual epistemology must integrate first-person fidelity with second- and third-person checks. Ann Taves's building-block approach models descriptive neutrality: experiences are parsed into components without pre-judging their truth-value, enabling cross-case comparison (16). The researcher adopts this descriptive restraint at the outset, then advances to a normative phase governed by explicit criteria: coherence with the broader web of belief; reliability indicated by stable doxastic practices; intersubjective convergence across independent witnesses; susceptibility to credible defeaters; and transformative fruitfulness tracked over time.

Linda Zagzebski's virtue epistemology supplies regulative ideals—intellectual humility, conscientiousness, and courage—that discipline both the reception and the criticism of extraordinary claims (17). The researcher maintains that without such virtues, even sophisticated criteria can be gamed; with them, the field can distinguish robust from spurious claims.

Clarifying boundaries avoids category mistakes. Spiritual epistemology is not identical with revelation claims, though it often overlaps with them; it is not reducible to metaphysics, though it has metaphysical implications; it is not mere psychology of religion, though it consults psychological findings. Its task is neither to immunize mystical claims from critique nor to naturalize them away. Rather, the aim is a calibrated, fallibilist realism: some mystical disclosures rise to knowledge-status under multi-criteria appraisal; others remain plausible yet underdetermined; still others are responsibly rejected. The researcher therefore proposes treating mediation as a parameter to be measured, not a defeater to be presumed; treating ineffability as a pointer to non-propositional acquaintance that can nevertheless yield constrained propositional consequences; and treating communal practices as epistemic environments whose virtues and vices shape outcomes. On this definition, spiritual epistemology is a comparative, virtue-regulated inquiry into mystical cognition that seeks defeasible but genuine knowledge of ultimate reality.

2.1. The Stakes of Mystical Cognition: Authority, Publicness, and Defeasibility:

The epistemic stakes of mystical cognition crystallize around three pressure points: first-person authority, public assessability, and defeasibility. At the first pole, classical accounts contend that certain experiences carry an intrinsic “noetic” force—what James called “states of insight into depths of truth unplumbed by the discursive intellect,” accompanied by a “curious sense of authority” for the experiencer (18). The researcher acknowledges this phenomenological authority as a *prima facie* indicator of cognitive contact, yet argues that it remains *pro tempore*: an initial presumption to inquire, not a final warrant to conclude. In other words, the felt immediacy of disclosure can ground inquiry, but must submit to criteria that survive the evaporations of affect and the passage of time.

Publicness enters via communal practices that render private disclosures assessable. Alston's account of doxastic practices maintains that religious communities develop socially stabilized procedures for forming and evaluating beliefs from putative disclosures (observation, counsel, liturgical testing, spiritual direction), thereby achieving a functional analog to perception in ordinary life (19).

The researcher agrees, but proposes two strengthening conditions: first, inter-practice calibration across traditions to check insularity; second, internal mechanisms for identifying pseudo-experiences (e.g., self-contradiction, moral disintegration). Without such controls, the “practice” model risks degenerating into epistemic echo chambers.

Defeasibility is the third stake. Plantinga’s externalist framework rightly emphasizes that many beliefs—religious among them—can be properly basic when produced by cognitive faculties functioning properly in a suitable environment (20). Nevertheless, even properly basic beliefs are vulnerable to defeaters: undercutting defeaters that sap warrant (e.g., discovering a reliable mechanism that routinely generates religious illusions), or rebutting defeaters that present contrary truths (e.g., a contradiction with well-grounded doctrines or facts). The researcher contends that responsible religious basicity in plural contexts must institutionalize defeater management: articulate what would count against a claim; track exposure to such counters; and specify conditions under which revision, suspension, or rejection is normatively required.

The constructivist challenge intensifies these stakes. Katz’s thesis that “there are no pure (i.e., unmediated) experiences” implies that the content and seeming authority of mysticism are inextricable from prior conceptual-linguistic schemes (21). The researcher grants that mediation is ubiquitous but denies that ubiquity entails epistemic impotence. Theory-ladenness does not obliterate world-directedness; rather, it makes responsible method indispensable. Hence, the relevant question is not “mediated or not?” but “how mediated, by what, and with what correctives?” Cross-traditional comparisons and intra-traditional criteria (consistency, moral fruits, long-range coherence) can function as partial correctives without pretending to achieve a view from nowhere.

Virtue-theoretic considerations bind these threads into a regulative ethos. As Zagzebski argues, intellectual virtues—conscientiousness, courage, humility—shape not only how evidence is gathered but also how it is retained or surrendered (22). The researcher maintains that mystical cognition is peculiarly sensitive to these virtues: humility resists premature universalization of one’s private horizon; courage resists reductionist dismissal; conscientiousness tracks defeaters over time. Complementarily, Roberts and Wood emphasize the communal cultivation of such traits, reminding us that intellectual character is learned in practices and institutions (23). The researcher therefore proposes that publicness is not merely procedural but characterological: a community’s epistemic credibility depends on the virtues it reliably inculcates in practitioners and adjudicators alike.

A final methodological stake concerns descriptive neutrality and normative assessment. Taves's "building-block" approach provides a disciplined, non-credal taxonomy for identifying and comparing experiences ("specialness," attribution, triggers), thereby supplying a common descriptive baseline across traditions (24). The researcher endorses this as a first step while insisting on a second step of normative evaluation by explicit criteria: coherence with a wider web of belief, reliability indexed by stable doxastic practices, intersubjective convergence across independent witnesses, susceptibility to defeat, and transformative fruitfulness sustained over time. This two-step procedure protects against both credulity and cynicism: descriptive neutrality slows premature judgment; normative criteria prevent methodological quietism.

In sum, the stakes resolve into a calibrated triad. Mystical authority: acknowledged but provisional. Publicness: achieved through disciplined practices and virtue-formed communities, open to cross-traditional calibration. Defeasibility: codified, not merely conceded, with clear conditions for retention, revision, or rejection. From the researcher's perspective, only under this triad can mystical cognition rise from compelling subjectivity to defensible knowledge-status.

3.1. Method and Criteria: Phenomenology, Comparative Philosophy, and Virtue Epistemology:

This study adopts a triangulated method to adjudicate mystical knowledge-claims: disciplined phenomenology to secure descriptive fidelity; comparative philosophy to test claims across diverse traditions; and virtue-epistemic regulation to ensure responsible uptake, critique, and revision. The resulting criteria—coherence, reliability within doxastic practices, intersubjective convergence, susceptibility to defeaters, and transformative fruitfulness—operate in concert rather than isolation.

Phenomenology provides the first anchor. Husserl's epoché suspends premature metaphysical posits in order to "return to the things themselves," clearing a space where the structures of experience can be described without reductive or credulous distortion (25). The researcher endorses this bracketing as a methodological humility that neither rubber-stamps nor pathologizes mystical claims at the outset. Yet descriptive neutrality is not the terminus; it is a runway. Merleau-Ponty reminds us that "the world is not what I think, but what I live," underscoring that experience is embodied, situated, and meaning-bearing prior to explicit theory (26). The researcher agrees and infers that mystical phenomenology must attend to practices (fasting, prayer, meditation), affective tones (peace, awe, dread), and

temporal profiles (sudden vs. cultivated insight), because these often function as internal markers of reliability or distortion.

Hermeneutics refines phenomenology by articulating how meanings are generated and tested. As Ricoeur famously wrote, “the symbol gives rise to thought” (27). The researcher concurs but adds: symbols also constrain thought; they do not license arbitrary elaboration. Accordingly, the study treats visionary and nondual reports as symbolically dense disclosures whose propositional “uptake” must be disciplined by textual traditions, communal canons of discernment, and cross-case comparison. This yields a criterion of constrained interpretability: acceptable interpretations preserve the phenomenological core while integrating with a tradition’s best theological-philosophical grammar.

Comparative philosophy then functions as an epistemic stress test. Clooney’s comparative theology models “deep learning across religious borders,” in which close reading within and across traditions generates mutually illuminative judgments rather than superficial harmonization (28). The researcher endorses this and adds two guardrails: first, symmetrical charity—each tradition is read at its strongest; second, calibrated contrast—irreducible differences are mapped and explained, not dissolved. From this flow two criteria: intersubjective convergence (family resemblances across independent lineages) and principled divergence (disagreements traceable to explicable metaphysical or soteriological commitments). Convergence raises a defeasible presumption of contact with a common reality-structure; principled divergence specifies the limits of that presumption.

Virtue epistemology supplies the regulative ethos for both description and comparison. Zagzebski argues that intellectual virtues such as conscientiousness, humility, and courage are not merely moral ornaments but cognitive excellences guiding belief-formation and retention (29). The researcher agrees and operationalizes them thus: humility resists hasty universalization of one’s experience; conscientiousness tracks possible defeaters and revises when indicated; courage resists both reductionist dismissal and uncritical enthusiasm. These virtues are cultivated communally; therefore, the reliability of mystical cognition partly depends on the integrity of the practices and institutions that form practitioners and adjudicators.

Doxastic practice theory provides a procedural check. Alston’s analysis shows that traditions develop socially stabilized methods for forming beliefs from putative disclosures—methods that can be assessed for internal coherence, track record, and openness to correction (30). The researcher accepts doxastic practices as *prima facie* credible when they exhibit:

- internal consistency.
- mechanisms for weeding out pseudo-experiences.
- long-range fruits aligning with the tradition's highest moral-intellectual ideals.

This supports a criterion of reliability-in-practice: beliefs issuing from vetted practices enjoy initial warrant, defeasible by counter-evidence.

Finally, a two-step evaluative workflow governs the application of these tools. Taves's building-block approach supplies a neutral descriptive taxonomy (attribution of "specialness," triggers, context), enabling comparisons without prejudging truth (31). The researcher adopts this as Step One. Step Two adds normative criteria:

- coherence with a well-ordered web of belief.
- reliability via disciplined doxastic practices.
- intersubjective convergence or principled divergence mapped comparatively.
- explicit defeat-conditions and responsiveness to defeaters.
- transformative fruitfulness sustained over time.

Together they yield a graded verdict structure: minimal credibility (descriptive clarity only), qualified warrant (multiple criteria satisfied, defeasibly), or robust knowledge-claim (broad satisfaction plus resilience to serious defeaters).

In sum, the method marries phenomenological fidelity, hermeneutic discipline, cross-traditional testing, and virtue regulation. The researcher's position is that only under such triangulation can mystical disclosures responsibly cross the threshold from compelling subjectivity to knowledge proper, and that the proposed criteria provide a transparent pathway for both endorsement and critique.

Chapter I Summary:

Chapter I established the conceptual and methodological scaffolding for a rigorous spiritual epistemology. It defined the field as a comparative, virtue-regulated, fallibilist inquiry into when and how mystical disclosures can justifiably count as knowledge.

The researcher distinguished three domains—acquaintance (non-inferential awareness), interpretive-propositional (doctrinal and philosophical articulation), and practical-transformative (long-range moral-existential fruits)—arguing that none is sufficient alone, but together they enable calibrated assessment.

The stakes were framed around a triad: first-person authority acknowledged as prima facie but provisional; publicness secured through disciplined communal practices and cross-traditional calibration; and defeasibility codified with clear conditions for retention, revision, or rejection. Methodologically, the chapter integrated phenomenological fidelity, hermeneutic discipline, and comparative testing under a virtue-epistemic ethos, yielding actionable criteria—coherence, reliability within doxastic practices, intersubjective convergence or principled divergence, susceptibility to defeaters, and transformative fruitfulness.

The researcher's position is that mediation does not entail relativism and ineffability does not preclude constrained propositional traction; rather, both demand responsible method. The chapter concluded by proposing a graded verdict structure—from minimal credibility to robust knowledge—thereby converting elusive experiences into publicly assessable claims without domesticating their transcendence. This framework sets the stage for evaluating classical theories and cross-traditional case studies in the next chapter.

Chapter II:

Classical and Contemporary Theories of Religious Knowledge:

1.2. Noetic and Perceptual Models:

From James to Alston: Perceptual and quasi-perceptual accounts propose that some religious experiences are epistemically analogous to sense perception: they present themselves as disclosures of a reality independent of the subject and thereby confer prima facie justification. James's classic depiction remains programmatic: mystical states are "states of insight into depths of truth unplumbed by the discursive intellect," which "carry with them a curious sense of authority" for the experiencer (32). The researcher accepts the descriptive force of this "noetic" tone but insists that authority must be construed as prima facie and defeasible, not incorrigible, lest phenomenology be mistaken for warrant.

Two influential developments sharpen the analogy. First, Swinburne's Principle of Credulity and Principle of Testimony argue that, ceteris paribus, it is reasonable to trust appearances and the reports of others unless we possess specific defeating conditions (33). "How things seem to be" is evidence for "how things are" absent counterevidence; likewise, testimony transmits prima facie warrant. The researcher endorses these as default rational stances that prevent global skepticism, but adds that in religious cases the ceteris paribus clause must be weighty: recognized

sources of illusion (suggestibility, pathology), doctrinally loaded interpretations, and communal incentives necessitate thicker defeat criteria than in ordinary perception.

Second, Alston's doxastic practice theory reconceives religious experience as embedded in socially regulated practices for forming and evaluating beliefs (e.g., prayerful attending, spiritual direction, communal discernment). Within a "mature, socially established doxastic practice," beliefs formed in accordance with its rules enjoy *prima facie* rationality unless defeated (34). This shifts the justificatory focus from atomistic experiences to practice-level reliability. The researcher concurs that this move is a major advance: it relocates warrant from private immediacy to socially testable patterns, enabling comparisons of track records and internal controls. Yet a residual worry remains: practice-dependent justification risks epistemic insularity. Therefore, the researcher argues that responsible practice-theory requires two external calibrations—cross-traditional comparison and articulated defeat conditions—if it is to rise above communal coherence.

A recurrent objection targets the disanalogy between religious and sensory perception: the absence of shared, manipulable objects and public tests. James already noted the "private" authority of mystical states; their "overbeliefs" are supplied by the subject's tradition (32). Critics press that such privacy blocks the perceptual analogy. The researcher responds that publicness in epistemology is scalar, not binary: while religious disclosures lack laboratory manipulability, they possess other forms of intersubjective calibration—long-range stability of reports within a practice, convergence of salient phenomenological features across independent lineages, and the possibility of falsification by moral-cognitive collapse. These are weaker than physical replication but not epistemically vacuous.

Another objection is circularity: if a practice authorizes beliefs that, in turn, vindicate the practice, justification seems question-begging. Alston's reply appeals to parity: perceptual practices also use outputs to confirm inputs, and global justificatory circularity is unavoidable (34). The researcher grants the parity but insists on strengthening the circle's integrity via independent checkpoints: psychological screening for pathology; doctrinal coherence tests; exposure to critical interlocutors; and performance indicators such as enhanced intellectual virtue and moral integrity. In short, a virtuous circle must be demonstrably "tight" and open to disruption by defeaters.

Finally, the specter of pluralism: if Buddhist, Vedāntic, Sufi, and Pentecostal practitioners report divergent ultimates under ostensibly reliable practices, does the perceptual model implode? Swinburne allows that appearances can conflict and be

sorted by overall explanatory power (33). James counseled a pragmatic assessment of “fruits for life” (32). The researcher synthesizes: conflict does not automatically discredit the perceptual analogy; rather, it demands a graded verdict structure—some disclosures may reflect a common core with divergent metaphysical glosses; others may be partially overlapping; some will be defeasibly disconfirmed by incoherence or vice. The upshot is not a retreat from perceptualism but its refinement: religious “perception” is possible, but only within virtue-regulated, defeater-sensitive practices tested comparatively.

2.2. Proper Basicity and Reformed Epistemology:

Scope and Limits: Reformed epistemology contends that belief in God can be “properly basic,” warranted without inferential support when produced by cognitive faculties functioning properly in an appropriate environment according to a design plan successfully aimed at truth. Plantinga’s formulation reframes “evidence” by locating warrant in proper function rather than in evidentialist satisfaction: “If my belief is produced by cognitive faculties functioning properly... in a congenial epistemic environment... then my belief has warrant” (35). The researcher acknowledges the power of this externalist turn: it rescues theistic belief from an artificially narrow evidentialism and grants parity with many ordinary beliefs (memory, other minds) that we rationally hold non-inferentially. Yet the researcher insists that parity is only the beginning; pluralism and defeat conditions press for further articulation.

Plantinga’s Aquinas/Calvin model specifies a *sensus divinitatis*—a natural disposition that yields theistic belief in appropriate circumstances (sunset, moral guilt, danger) (36). The attractiveness of this account lies in its phenomenological fit with many theists’ self-reports and in its explanation of widespread theistic belief without positing illicit inference. Still, two constraints are crucial. First, proper basicity must not be conflated with incorrigibility. Plantinga himself allows for defeaters, both undercutting and rebutting, that can “remove warrant” if not answered (37). The researcher endorses this and adds that responsible basicity in a plural world requires proactive defeat management: practitioners should specify what would count as a serious defeater (e.g., persistent cognitive malfunction, moral-cognitive collapse, compelling alternative explanations) and how it would be addressed.

Second, cross-traditional portability. If the same externalist architecture can underwrite Christian theism, Advaita nondualism, or Buddhist non-theism, does the framework become too permissive? Plantinga acknowledges the “*de jure/de facto*” distinction; reformed epistemology answers the rationality challenge (*de jure*) while

leaving truth (de facto) to separate assessment (35). The researcher agrees with the division of labor but warns that, absent comparative constraints, the model risks underwriting incompatible basicities without adjudicative traction. A virtue-epistemic supplement helps: communities should cultivate intellectual humility, conscientiousness, and courage so that basic beliefs are retained or revised in proportion to encountered defeaters and cross-traditional evidence (38). Thus, basicity becomes regulated rather than laissez-faire.

A classic internalist objection charges opacity: because proper function and design plan are “invisible from the inside,” the subject lacks access to the very factors that justify her belief. Plantinga replies that internal access is not necessary for warrant; many warranted beliefs (e.g., memory) lack reflective grounding (36). The researcher grants the point but argues for a layered response: while internal access is not necessary for warrant, some degree of accessible justification is necessary for responsible agency in plural contexts. Hence, a dual-aspect norm: external warrant confers entitlement; accessible reasons facilitate responsible dialogue and revision across communities.

Another objection draws on divine hiddenness: if a loving God exists, why is belief not nonresistantly available to all? Persistent reasonable nonbelief seems to undercut the claim that the *sensus divinitatis* functions properly in the human population (39). Plantinga’s reply invokes the noetic effects of sin and the complexity of divine purposes (36). The researcher regards this as a possible, not compulsory, defense and proposes an empirical-communal test: where the *sensus* is said to be operative, we should observe long-range patterns of moral-existential transformation and intellectual virtue that are difficult to replicate by purely secular controls; otherwise, the hypothesis risks explanatory thinness.

Finally, basic belief is not bare belief. Plantinga emphasizes that the internal instigation of the Holy Spirit confers a stronger form of warrant upon specifically Christian commitments (37). Critics worry that such claims beg the question. The researcher suggests reframing: treat such conferrals as defeasible augmentations, not as insulation. They should heighten, not relax, accountability to defeaters, communal discernment, and cross-traditional calibration. In effect, special graces raise the bar of responsibility.

In sum, the researcher endorses reformed epistemology’s central insight: some religious beliefs can be properly basic and warranted by proper-function externalism. Yet its scope must be disciplined by explicit defeat-management, virtue-regulated responsibility, and comparative portability conditions. Under these constraints, proper

basicity becomes a live option for spiritual knowledge without collapsing into permissivism or sectarian insulation.

3.2. Constructivism, Contextualism, and Neurocognitive Reduction:

A Critical Appraisal: Constructivist and contextualist accounts challenge the very idea of “raw” mystical data by arguing that what seems immediate is saturated by prior conceptual-linguistic schemes. Katz’s programmatic thesis is terse and influential: “there are no pure (i.e., unmediated) experiences” because all experience “is processed through, organized by, and makes itself available” via culturally available categories (40). The researcher accepts the warning against naïve immediatism, but rejects the slide from “some mediation” to “total construction.” Degrees of mediation are compatible with contact-realism: just as theory-laden perception can still be world-directed in science, symbol-laden mystical cognition can be reliably reality-responsive under disciplined conditions.

Historical critics reinforce the caution. Sharf argues that modern Buddhist reports of “experience” often mirror reformist apologetics, not timeless phenomenology; “experience” functions rhetorically to legitimate particular constructions of practice and doctrine (41). The researcher agrees that institutional incentives and apologetic agendas can shape what is said and how it is said; hence the need for practice-internal filters (discernment, spiritual direction) and external checks (cross-traditional comparison, defeater management). Still, rhetorical shaping does not entail semantic emptiness. A rhetoric of experience can overreach, yet it may still trace genuine acquaintance that demands careful, not cynical, appraisal.

Against strong constructivism, “pure consciousness” defenders maintain that some mystical states exhibit minimal or null content across traditions. Forman claims that reports of a “wakeful, contentless, nonintentional consciousness” recur trans-culturally and are best explained by a shared phenomenological core (42). “The evidence suggests that certain states are essentially nonintentional,” he argues, distinguishing them from doctrinal interpretations appended later (42). The researcher partially concurs: family-resemblance convergences—stillness, nonduality, cessation of mentation—deserve weight. Yet even “contentless” states are not epistemically self-certifying; their cognitive import must be tested for coherence, fruits, and vulnerability to defeaters, lest phenomenological sameness be mistaken for metaphysical identity. In short, convergence raises a defeasible presumption, not a verdict.

Empirical psychometrics adds a different lens. Hood’s Mysticism Scale (M-Scale) famously yields stable factors—introvertive and extrovertive unity, sacredness, ineffability—across diverse samples (43). Such cross-cultural factor

structure suggests patterned regularities rather than sheer cultural invention. The researcher acknowledges this evidential nudge toward a common phenomenological grammar. At the same time, factor convergence cannot by itself settle ontological questions; it is consistent with multiple hypotheses—from neurocognitive commonalities to genuine access to a shared ultimate. Thus, the M-Scale offers a comparative baseline, not an ontological shortcut.

Neurocognitive reductionists propose that brain-level accounts undercut the epistemic force of mysticism. Newberg and d'Aquili correlate unitary states with downregulation in the posterior superior parietal lobes and alterations in frontal attention networks, concluding that “neurophysiological mechanisms can generate experiences of unity and timelessness” (44). The researcher grants the correlations but denies the reductive inference. Explaining the mechanism of an experience does not adjudicate the veridicality of what it purports to disclose. Vision’s neural basis does not refute what is seen; by parity, neural correlates of unity do not refute the unity disclosed. Mechanism may be a conduit, not a counterfeit. The relevant epistemic question is reliability: under what trained conditions do these mechanisms tend to produce true beliefs?

Cognitive science of religion deepens the challenge by appealing to evolved biases. Barrett argues that a hyperactive agency detection device inclines humans to over-ascribe agency, potentially explaining religious intuitions without positing their truth (45). The researcher accepts underdetermination: such accounts can explain why belief is common without deciding whether specific beliefs are true. Indeed, if ultimate reality is personal or trans-personal mind, the world could be so fitted to our cognitive architecture that agency detection is not simply an illusion-generator but a truth-tracking sensitivity when regulated by disciplined practices and intellectual virtues.

A mediating stance emerges. Taves’s “building-block” model recommends parsing experiences into attributions of “specialness,” triggers, and contextual factors to avoid premature truth-claims or dismissals (46). The researcher endorses this descriptive restraint as Step One; Step Two requires normative appraisal by criteria already articulated: coherence with a well-ordered web of belief; reliability within disciplined doxastic practices; intersubjective convergence and principled divergence; explicit defeat-conditions; and long-range transformative fruitfulness.

On this calibrated view, constructivism rightly curbs naïveté, neurocognition rightly demands mechanism-awareness, and virtue-responsibility prevents credulity; yet none of these, singly or together, forces global skepticism. Instead, they refine the

conditions under which mystical disclosures may responsibly claim knowledge-status: fallible, defeasible, and nevertheless, at times, genuinely truth-conducive.

Chapter II Summary:

Chapter II interrogated the main epistemological options for grounding religious knowledge and argued for a refined, defeater-sensitive perceptualism regulated by virtues and comparative checks. Reassessing James and Alston, the researcher upheld the “noetic” character of some experiences while rejecting incorrigibility, shifting warrant from atomized episodes to socially regulated doxastic practices capable of intersubjective calibration and defeat management. Swinburne’s credulity and testimony principles were retained as rational defaults, but only under thick ceteris paribus clauses appropriate to religion’s vulnerability to suggestion and pathology.

Plantinga’s reformed epistemology was affirmed for relocating warrant in proper function and permitting properly basic belief, yet disciplined by explicit defeat conditions, virtue-regulated responsibility, and cross-traditional portability to avoid permissivism. Constructivist and neurocognitive critiques were engaged as necessary constraints—exposing mediation, rhetoric, and mechanism—without granting them reductive veto power; theory-ladenness need not negate reality-responsiveness.

The chapter thus consolidated a graded verdict structure for religious claims: prima facie authority anchored in practice-level reliability; publicness achieved via communal testing, comparative calibration, and accessible reasons; and defeasibility codified through articulated rebutting and undercutting conditions.

The net result is a fallibilist, realist framework that neither immunizes mysticism from critique nor collapses it into cultural construction, positioning spiritual knowledge as possible, sometimes actual, and always accountable.

*Chapter III:
Comparative Mystical Epistemes in Global Traditions:*

1.3. Islamic Sufism: Kashf, Yaqīn, and Ontologies of Disclosure:

Within classical Sufism, knowing God is framed as an ascent in disclosure (kashf) that ripens into certitude (yaqīn). In *Deliverance from Error*, al-Ghazālī narrates the exhaustion of syllogistic confidence and the advent of “a light which God Most High cast into my breast,” by which realities became “unveiled” beyond dialectic (47). The researcher accepts this as phenomenological testimony but adds: such “light” is not an epistemic *carte blanche*. Al-Ghazālī himself tests it by coherence with revelation and by durable transformation of character; thus, Sufi knowing is not anti-rational but trans-rational, supervening upon reason while binding it to spiritual-ethical proofs. The researcher endorses this “discipline of the noetic”: unveiling must answer to stability, scriptural consonance, and moral purification, or else it lapses into private enthusiasm.

Yaqīn is traditionally tiered: ‘ilm al-yaqīn (certitude by knowledge), ‘ayn al-yaqīn (certitude by direct “seeing”), and haqq al-yaqīn (certitude by realized truth). Ibn ʿArabī radicalizes this gradation into a participatory ontology: in *tajallī* (self-disclosure), “the Real is the knower, the known, and the knowledge,” reconfiguring the knower’s mode of being (48). The researcher endorses the explanatory power of this ontological thickening—mystical “authority” is not merely affective but ontic, because the self is transposed into a theophanic relation. Yet the researcher insists on a corollary constraint: the more ontologically intimate the claim, the more stringent the communal disciplines (suhba, adab, murāqaba) required to ward off projection and delusion.

Ibn ʿArabī’s hermeneutics of imagination (khayāl) clarifies how kashf yields content without literalism. The “imaginal world” (ʿālam al-mithāl) mediates between sensible and intelligible orders, enabling forms to “give to the spiritual a body and to the body a spirit” (49). The researcher affirms this as a powerful constraint-and-permission model: symbols neither license arbitrary readings nor reduce to mere allegory. Epistemically, it issues a criterion of constrained interpretability: readings of disclosures must preserve the experiential core, cohere with Qurʾānic-theological grammar (tawhīd, prophecy, law), and integrate with the tradition’s best metaphysics of theophany. From the researcher’s vantage, this imaginal discipline is precisely what allows visionary cognition to aspire to knowledge rather than to poetry.

Sufi lineages institutionalize intersubjective calibration. Manuals and orders share a “grammar of states and stations” (ahwāl/maqāmāt), which renders the path publicly intelligible and corrigible. Al-Qushayrī’s *Risāla* codifies signs, risks, and tests of states, anchoring putatively private experiences in communal canons of discernment (50). The researcher regards such codification as a practice-level reliability indicator: when independent lineages converge on structures like “veils,” “annihilation (fanā) and subsistence (baqā),” and the tests appropriate to them, a defeasible presumption of contact with a common reality-structure arises. Still, the presumption is defeasible: antinomian outcomes, egocentric inflation, or doctrinal incoherence are named as *istidrāj* (deceptive “drawing along”), not authentic *kashf*. The researcher endorses this internal defeat-register as evidence of Sufism’s self-corrective resources.

At the same time, Sufi epistemology is not monolithic. Ibn ʿArabī’s language of *waḥdat al-wujūd* drew both fascination and critique. Chittick’s systematic exposition shows that unity of being, properly read, asserts radical dependence rather than identity: the cosmos subsists as divine self-disclosure without collapsing Creator into creation⁽⁵¹⁾. The researcher agrees and urges interpretive charity: when contextualized in *tajallī* metaphysics, accusations of pantheism lose force. Yet the researcher also cautions that metaphysical exuberance heightens the burden of clarity and accountability; ontological poetry must be tethered to exegetical rigor and to the durable fruits of humility, justice, and intellectual sobriety.

Sainthood (*walāya*) further institutionalizes epistemic authority without jettisoning fallibilism. Chodkiewicz demonstrates that *walāya* functions as a hierarchy of realized knowledge ordered to prophetic normativity, not a rival to it⁽⁵²⁾. The researcher supports this alignment: true *kashf* never abrogates the *Sharīʿa*’s moral-ritual form but discloses its inner telos. Hence, *Sharīʿa*-conformity operates as an intrinsic defeater-management principle: claims that license lawlessness indict themselves.

In sum, Sufi epistemology combines an ontology of divine self-disclosure, a hermeneutics of the imaginal, and rigorous communal regulation. From the researcher’s perspective, *kashf* can amount to knowledge—fallible and defeasible, yet truth-conducive—when it satisfies four jointly necessary conditions:

- scriptural-theological coherence.
- communal calibration through established disciplines and masters.
- constrained interpretability via the imaginal grammar.

- sustained transformative fruits. Where these obtain, the passage from compelling subjectivity to defensible knowledge becomes intelligible rather than merely asserted.

2.3. Christian Mysticism: Apophatic Knowing, Discernment, and Ecclesial Testing:

Christian mystical epistemology is structured by a rigorous apophaticism, a discriminating praxis of discernment, and ecclesial procedures that test private disclosures against communal normativity. Pseudo-Dionysius's *Mystical Theology* sets the canon: ascent to God occurs by "unknowing," a disciplined negation of all predicates whereby the mind is "united... to that which is altogether beyond knowledge" (53). The researcher endorses the epistemic force of apophasis not as anti-intellectualism but as an anti-idolatrous check on conceptual reification: negation curbs representational overreach while licensing a non-propositional acquaintance that can have guarded propositional consequences. In short, the Dionysian move is a virtue of intellectual humility, not a flight from reason.

Palamas's essence–energies distinction supplies a metaphysical grammar for this epistemic stance. According to the Triads, while the divine essence remains inaccessibly transcendent, the uncreated energies are communicable and perceptible to the deified, grounding an experiential *theōria* that is neither hallucination nor pantheism (54). The researcher agrees that this distinction clarifies how acquaintance avoids collapsing into identity: what is "seen" is not God's essence but God's operative presence. Hence, the Palamite model refines the perceptual analogy: mystical "vision" is ontologically anchored yet circumscribed, a paradigm case of constrained acquaintance.

Within this framework, Teresa of Ávila offers stringent interior criteria that temper the "noetic" sense of authority. In the *Interior Castle*, Teresa warns that extraordinary phenomena (locutions, raptures) are "suspect" unless accompanied by durable humility, charity, and obedience; moreover, true experiences "leave the soul in great quiet and humility" rather than in agitation or self-importance (55). The researcher concurs and elevates these from pastoral advice to epistemic norms: stable moral transformation and dispositional humility function as reliability markers of the doxastic practice. By contrast, disquiet, inflation, or antinomian license are *prima facie* defeaters.

John of the Cross radicalizes this discipline with his doctrine of the "dark night." In the passive purgations, God removes sensible consolations precisely to free the intellect and will from possessive clinging; knowledge matures as unknowing,

and love purifies cognition (56). The researcher endorses this as a calibration against affective verificationism: if warrant depended on felt sweetness, the epistemic economy would be biased toward consolations and away from purification. Instead, the Carmelite tradition teaches that maturation increases epistemic caution: less phenomenal “glory,” more charity and quiet faith. Thus, darkness is not ignorance; it is a higher-order reliability condition.

Classic Catholic and Ignatian discernment converts these interior criteria into institutional practice. Ignatius’s Rules for the Discernment of Spirits distinguish consolations that move toward faith, hope, and love from counterfeits marked by “false peace,” haste, and isolation; crucially, he insists on external corroboration and submission of extraordinary experiences to competent spiritual directors (57). The researcher affirms that such externalization transforms private phenomenology into publicly testable claims: direction, confession, and obedience create communal filters that weed out idiosyncrasy and pathology. Ecclesial processes thus embody defeater-management: doctrine constrains interpretation; pastoral oversight tests stability; liturgical participation checks self-enclosure.

Contemporary philosophy of mysticism can misconstrue apophaticism as semantic evacuation. Denys Turner argues that apophasis is not merely saying “nothing” about God but refusing to treat God as a being among beings; its “negativity” is a precision instrument for protecting divine transcendence while re-educating desire and language (58). The researcher agrees and extends: apophatic discipline functions as an epistemic virtue that both licenses acquaintance and limits assertion, thereby enhancing, not diminishing, credibility. Likewise, Coakley reframes contemplative practice as an ascetic-epistemic discipline in which desire is reordered; only under this transformation do claims to knowledge avoid projection and domination (59). The researcher endorses this convergence of asceticism and cognition: sanctification operates as a truth-conducive process.

Objections persist: does ecclesial testing merely enforce doctrinal conformity, stifling genuine disclosure? The researcher contends that, at its best, the tradition’s tests are not arbitrary gatekeeping but reliability safeguards analogous to peer review: they evaluate coherence with the canonical rule of faith, longitudinal fruits, and susceptibility to correction. Conversely, the researcher rejects romantic antinomianism: where putative revelations license disobedience, novelty for its own sake, or moral disarray, the Christian practice has names—illusion, prelest—that mark such states as epistemic failures. The deeper insight is that Christian mysticism weds apophatic realism to communal discernment, generating a calibrated pathway

from acquaintance to knowledge: union without confusion, testimony without triumphalism, rigor without reductionism.

3.3. Advaita Vedānta and Mahāyāna Buddhism: Nonduality, Emptiness, and Insight:

Advaita Vedānta and Mahāyāna Buddhism articulate rival yet intriguingly convergent paradigms of ultimate realization—*aparokṣa-jñāna* (nondual knowledge) and *prajñā* (wisdom realizing emptiness). Both destabilize ordinary representational cognition, but they diverge on the status of the ultimate: Advaita affirms a nondual, self-luminous Brahman/Ātman; Madhyamaka denies any self-existent essence (*svabhāva*), insisting on dependent origination and emptiness (*śūnyatā*). The researcher argues that these are not simply contradictory metaphysics but distinct epistemic programs with different constraints on what counts as veridical disclosure.

Advaita's epistemic telos is direct, non-inferential knowledge of Brahman through the sublation of ignorance (*avidyā*). Śaṅkara repeatedly distinguishes mediate knowledge from "immediate" realization: the *mahāvākya* "tat tvam asi" is not merely a proposition to be believed but a pointer to nondual acquaintance in which the knower, known, and knowledge coincide (60). "Liberation results from immediate knowledge alone," he avers, "not from ritual or works" (61). The researcher concurs that Advaita marks a crucial distinction between descriptive assent and transformative acquaintance; however, the researcher cautions that the very claim to immediacy must be norm-governed. Hence the Advaitin triad—*śravaṇa* (listening to scripture), *manana* (reflective assimilation), *nididhyāsana* (deep contemplation)—functions as an internal reliability procedure: scripture constrains claims, reasoning removes contradictions, and contemplative stabilization tests durability. From the researcher's perspective, these stages instantiate a doxastic practice with built-in defeat conditions (e.g., failure to eliminate residual dualistic grasping).

Madhyamaka's *prajñā* operates with opposite ontological valence and similar epistemic severity. Nāgārjuna's root argument shows that whatever is posited as essentially real collapses under analysis; "that which is dependently arisen, we call empty" and "this is itself the middle way" (62). The researcher endorses the anti-reification thrust: *prajñā* is not a vision of an ultimate substance but a non-grasping insight into the dependently arisen character of all phenomena, including the very notions of "ultimate" and "insight." Far from being nihilistic, this insight is pragmatically world-affirming: by unfixing reification, it removes the affective-cognitive knots that generate suffering. Yet the researcher also insists that emptiness-talk, to be epistemically responsible, must avoid becoming a new dogma; hence

Madhyamaka's self-cancelling hermeneutic—the emptiness of emptiness—operates as a meta-defeater against metaphysical inflation.

Striking convergences occur at the phenomenological edge. Reports of nondual awareness in Advaita (the “witness” that outlasts all modifications) and of non-conceptual equipoise in Buddhist meditation both speak of de-reification, stillness, and the cessation of proliferating thought (*vikalpa/prapañca*). Contemporary interpreters note family resemblances in the experiential grammar even as the metaphysical gloss diverges (63). The researcher agrees that such convergences create a defeasible presumption that certain disciplined practices disclose a shared structural feature of cognition—its capacity to relax grasping—and perhaps a common horizon of acquaintance. Nevertheless, the researcher resists hasty metaphysical unification: “same feel” need not entail “same ontological content.” Convergence licenses a hypothesis of contact; it does not settle the content of what is contacted.

Two diagnostic differences sharpen the comparative analysis. First, intentionality: Advaita's *aparokṣa-jñāna* is often described as self-luminous awareness “of” Brahman that is identical with Brahman; Madhyamaka *prajñā*, by contrast, is an intentional “seeing” that undermines the very subject-object polarity, refusing to reify even awareness (62, 64). The researcher contends that these map distinct constraints on error: Advaita risks hypostatizing awareness; Madhyamaka risks evacuating positive content. Each tradition deploys safeguards: Advaita's *neti neti* (“not this, not that”) and *adhyāropa-apavāda* (superimposition and rescission) prevent crude substantialization; Madhyamaka's two truths framework protects pragmatic efficacy while curbing metaphysical overreach. Second, normativity: Advaita ties epistemic success to liberative identity with Brahman, indexed by freedom from bondage and fear; Buddhism ties it to the cessation of suffering and the flowering of compassion (*karuṇā*). The researcher treats these soteriological fruits as practice-relative reliability indicators, not mere by-products.

Do cognitive science and phenomenology adjudicate between them? Not decisively. Studies of advanced meditation show overlapping neural signatures in non-conceptual states (reduced default mode activity, attentional stabilization), but such mechanisms underdetermine ontology (65). Phenomenology can refine descriptions (e.g., minimal self, absorption), yet cannot alone decide between Brahman-realism and emptiness-realism. The researcher therefore proposes a graded comparative verdict: both traditions present disciplined, defeasible routes to transformative acquaintance; both embed their claims within robust doxastic

practices; both articulate defeat conditions (e.g., persistence of grasping, ethical deterioration). Where they diverge is not in the rigor of their epistemic ethos but in what they allow acquaintance to disclose: being as nondual identity (Advaita) or as the emptiness of any identity (Madhyamaka).

From the researcher's standpoint, pluralist realism need not flatten this difference. It can acknowledge a shared horizon—release from grasping and consequent liberation—while allowing that the ontological articulation of that release may be tradition-specific without being merely arbitrary. On this view, cross-traditional calibration tests for coherence, fruits, and vulnerability to defeaters can certify knowledge-claims as robust within and dialogically credible across traditions, even when ultimate metaphysical closure remains contested.

Chapter III Summary:

Chapter III, tested the proposed epistemic framework across three paradigmatic traditions and found that rigorous mystical knowing is possible where ontological claims are tethered to disciplined practices, constrained interpretation, and durable fruits. Sufi epistemology locates knowledge in kashf ripening into yaqīn, but only when unveiling is vetted by Sharīʿa-conformity, communal calibration, imaginal hermeneutics, and long-range moral-intellectual transformation.

The researcher argued that Ibn ʿArabī's participatory ontology explains the authority of disclosure while heightening the demand for virtue-regulated discernment. Christian mysticism, by contrast, institutionalizes apophatic realism: the Dionysian “unknowing,” Palamas's essence–energies grammar, and Carmelite purification converge with Ignatian discernment to convert private phenomenology into publicly testable claims. Here, humility, obedience, and charity are not pieties but reliability conditions. Advaita and Madhyamaka offer rival nondual epistemes—aparokṣa-jñāna and prajñā—whose phenomenological convergences (de-reification, non-conceptual stillness) coexist with principled ontological divergence (identity with Brahman vs. emptiness of any essence). The researcher judged both to be robust, defeasible doxastic practices with explicit defeat conditions and soteriological performance indicators. Taken together, the case studies vindicate a graded, virtue-regulated model: intersubjective calibration, constrained interpretability, and transformative fruits can raise mystical disclosures from compelling subjectivity to defensible knowledge, even amid deep metaphysical disagreement.

Chapter IV:

A Graded Model of Mystical Knowledge and Its Implications:

1.4. From Experience to Knowledge: Criteria, Virtues, and Reliability:

This section advances a graded model that translates compelling subjectivity into defensible knowledge by integrating criteria of assessment with the regulation of intellectual virtues. The model distinguishes three tiers: Minimal Credibility (MC), where claims are descriptively clear but not yet warranted; Qualified Warrant (QW), where multiple criteria are satisfied defeasibly; and Robust Knowledge (RK), where criteria are jointly met and resilient under serious defeaters. The researcher contends that mystical cognition rises to RK only when first-person authority is disciplined by practice-level reliability, intersubjective calibration, codified defeat-conditions, and durable transformative fruits—all governed by virtue-epistemic norms.

Starting point—prima facie authority: James famously notes that mystical states are “states of insight... [that] carry with them a curious sense of authority for those who experience them” (66). The researcher acknowledges this “noetic” tone as a pro tanto reason to inquire, not a final warrant to conclude; phenomenology signals, but does not settle, epistemic status.

Practice-level reliability: Alston’s doxastic practice theory reframes justification from atomized episodes to socially stabilized procedures of formation and evaluation. Within a mature practice, beliefs generated “in accordance with its rules” are prima facie rational unless defeated (67). The researcher endorses this shift and adds a strengthening clause: reliability must be evidenced by internal controls (discernment norms, textual canons, master–disciple oversight) and a non-accidental track record of avoiding known illusions. Without such controls, “practice” risks devolving into communal circularity.

Default rationality with thick caveats: Swinburne’s Principles of Credulity and Testimony counsel that, *ceteris paribus*, how things seem and what others sincerely report are to be trusted absent specific defeaters (68). The researcher accepts these as anti-skeptical baselines, but insists on religion-specific weighting of the *ceteris paribus* clause: recognized sources of illusion (suggestibility, psychopathology), doctrinal over-interpretation, and incentive structures demand heightened defeat-sensitivity relative to ordinary perception.

Externalist warrant and defeat-management: Plantinga relocates warrant in proper function: if a belief is produced by cognitive faculties functioning properly in an appropriate environment according to a design plan successfully aimed at truth, it can be “properly basic” (69). The researcher values this parity-restoring move, yet

emphasizes its own guardrails: even basic beliefs are vulnerable to rebutting and undercutting defeaters. Responsible basicity therefore requires institutionalized defeat-management—explicitly stating what would count against a claim (e.g., moral-cognitive collapse, incoherence with the tradition’s core grammar, compelling alternative explanations) and how revision or suspension would proceed.

Descriptive neutrality before normative verdicts: Taves’s building-block method supplies a non-credal taxonomy for parsing experiences (attributions of “specialness,” triggers, context), securing a common descriptive baseline (70). The researcher adopts this as Step One. Step Two is the normative appraisal via articulated criteria: coherence, reliability-in-practice, intersubjective calibration, defeat-management, and transformative fruitfulness. This two-step workflow curbs both credulity and reductionist dismissal.

Virtue regulation: Zagzebski argues that intellectual virtues—conscientiousness, humility, courage—are cognitive excellences guiding the responsible acquisition and retention of belief (71). The researcher concurs and specifies their operational roles in mystical cognition: humility resists premature universalization; conscientiousness tracks possible defeaters and updates accordingly; courage resists both reductionist scorn and romantic indulgence. Roberts and Wood stress that such virtues are communally cultivated; practices and institutions thus function as character-forming environments whose integrity conditions the reliability of their outputs (72). The researcher concludes that criteria alone are insufficient without the *habitus* that applies them well.

The graded model—necessary and sufficient conditions:

- MC: descriptive clarity via Taves-style analysis; no verdict on truth (70). The researcher treats MC as a researchable placeholder.
- QW: at least three criteria satisfied—(a) coherence with a well-ordered web of belief; (b) reliability-in-practice evidenced by internal controls and track record; (c) either intersubjective convergence within/ across independent lineages or principled divergence lucidly explained; plus (d) initial defeat-accounting and (e) emerging transformative fruits over time (67, 68, 70–72). The researcher regards QW as a defeasible warrant sufficient for responsible belief within a tradition and dialogical credibility across traditions.
- RK: all criteria satisfied in conjunction, with sustained resilience to serious defeaters over time, and virtue-regulated application demonstrably in place (66–72). The researcher argues that RK is rare but real; when achieved, mystical cognition warrants being called knowledge in a fallibilist, realist sense.

Objections and closure: Does pluralism undercut RK? The researcher answers: deep disagreement does not negate warrant where criteria are met; it limits scope and demands intellectual humility. Does externalism obscure reasons? The researcher proposes a dual-aspect norm: external warrant confers entitlement; accessible reasons sustain responsible agency in plural discourse.

In sum, mystical knowledge is possible and sometimes actual when phenomenological authority is channeled through reliable practices, tested intersubjectively, disciplined by virtues, and resilient under defeat. Anything less remains at MC or QW—serious, but short of knowledge proper.

2.4. Convergences, Deep Disagreements, and Pluralist Realism:

How should we interpret the striking cross-traditional convergences in mystical phenomenology alongside equally deep doctrinal disagreements? Hick's pluralistic hypothesis proposes that diverse salvific traditions are cognitively responsive to "the Real," an ultimately ineffable noumenon refracted through culturally mediated "experiential-expressive" schemes (73). The researcher acknowledges Hick's explanatory elegance—convergences without coercive uniformity—but judges his noumenal Real to be so content-thin that it risks vacuousness: "ineffability" can become an epistemic solvent that dissolves normativity. From the researcher's perspective, pluralism requires not an empty common denominator but calibrated criteria that allow graded warrants within and across traditions.

Heim's "multiple religious ends" model strengthens this point by contending that traditions may be orienting practitioners toward genuinely different consummations (e.g., communion with the triune God, nondual identity, realization of emptiness), not merely different descriptions of one end (74). The researcher finds Heim's thesis heuristically powerful: it reframes disagreement as soteriological parameterization rather than simple error. Yet the researcher adds a constraint: multiplicity of ends does not entail epistemic relativism. Ends must be tested by the previously articulated criteria—coherence, reliability-in-practice, intersubjective calibration, defeat-management, and transformative fruits. Where rival ends each satisfy these criteria to a high degree, pluralist realism counts them as partial, aspectual disclosures rather than mutually exclusive totalities.

Tradition-constituted rationality clarifies how such warrants are earned. MacIntyre argues that rational inquiry is tradition-embedded, with standards internal to practices that nevertheless permit genuine progress through self-critique, problem-solving power, and comparative success against rivals (75). The researcher endorses this as the meta-epistemic frame for mysticism: each tradition's doxastic practice sets

initial canons of interpretation and testing, but those canons face stress tests when engaging internal crises and external interlocutors. Progress is visible when a tradition can explain not only its successes but also why competitor traditions capture some truths yet miss others—an ability that lifts appraisal beyond mere parochial coherence.

Conceptual mediation need not negate realism. Putnam's internal realism insists that truth is not a "God's-eye" correspondence but constrained by conceptual schemes, while still resisting arbitrariness through rational acceptability within idealized epistemic conditions (76). The researcher appropriates this stance to spiritual epistemology: what counts as an adequate "take" on the ultimate is scheme-laden, yet subject to non-arbitrary constraints—logical coherence, experiential stability, community testing, and fruits. Thus, family resemblances (e.g., de-reification, humility, compassion) across Sufi, Carmelite, Advaitin, and Madhyamaka reports are not proof of identity of content, but they are constraints on plausible interpretation. The researcher maintains that such constraints support a pluralist realism: multiple true construals of an inexhaustible reality, each indexed to soteriological aims and disciplinary grammars.

The analogy with scientific paradigms is tempting but must be handled with care. Kuhn's account of incommensurability warns that paradigms can talk past each other while still enabling rational choice through problem-solving power and puzzle-resolution (77). The researcher draws a limited analogy: mystical traditions are paradigm-like in their taxonomies and tests, yet unlike scientific revolutions, they do not converge on a single successor framework. Instead, comparative evaluation proceeds by adjudicating domain-relative excellence: Which practice best produces its avowed goods? Which handles defeaters most transparently? Which integrates criticism without loss of integrity? Such questions permit rational preference without presupposing a single comprehensive victor.

A remaining worry is underdetermination: if phenomenological overlaps can be glossed by incompatible metaphysics, why call any of them knowledge? Wainwright argues that when experiences are embedded in mature traditions that meet reasonable standards of coherence and moral-spiritual transformation, they can confer "epistemic entitlement," even if not decisive proof (78). The researcher agrees but strengthens the bar: entitlement rises to warrant—and sometimes knowledge—only when the multi-criteria cluster is satisfied and shown resilient under serious defeaters. Where two traditions achieve Robust Knowledge by their own criteria and withstand cross-examination, pluralist realism interprets the situation not as stalemate

but as aspectual complementarity: one reality disclosed under divergent, norm-governed modes of acquaintance.

The researcher favors the language of “parameterized disclosure”: ultimate reality is inexhaustible; disciplines train attention to different parameters (personal presence, nondual identity, emptiness), yielding partially overlapping but non-collapsible truths.

Accordingly, deep disagreement remains a feature, not a bug. It disciplines triumphalism and enforces intellectual humility, even as graded warrants vindicate real knowledge-claims. Pluralist realism, so construed, neither dissolves differences into an anemic sameness nor surrenders to fragmentation. It treats convergences as defeasible indicators of contact, divergences as principled variations keyed to soteriological ends, and the best traditions as sites where truth becomes luminous under virtues and practices rightly ordered.

3.4. Defeaters, Responsibility Conditions, and Objections:

This section codifies responsibility conditions for mystical cognition and addresses leading objections—naturalistic reduction, peer disagreement and pluralism, circularity in practice-based justification, moral-cognitive failure, and the charge of unverifiability. The researcher’s thesis is that mystical claims attain responsible warrant only when embedded in institutions that (a) articulate explicit defeat-conditions, (b) cultivate intellectual-moral virtues, (c) demonstrate practice-level reliability, and (d) sustain transparency and corrigibility over time.

Defeaters—taxonomy and management: Following contemporary epistemology, two kinds of defeaters are salient. Undercutting defeaters attack the link between the experience and its putative truth (e.g., showing the mechanism routinely generates illusions); rebutting defeaters present counter-evidence for the negation of the claim (79).

The researcher requires that traditions publish defeat protocols: specify what, if discovered, would mandate suspension or revision, and show historical instances of such correction. Without explicit defeat-accounting, appeals to “mystery” risk becoming an epistemic escape hatch rather than a marker of transcendence. In this regard, virtue reliabilism is instructive: warrant accrues where belief-forming processes are reliable and the agent manifests intellectual virtues that responsively monitor error-signals (80). The researcher endorses this and adds that “reliability” must be demonstrated at the level of doxastic practices, not just individual episodes.

3.4.1. Objection 1. Naturalistic reduction:

Critics argue that once we possess robust neurocognitive accounts of mystical states, their evidential force evaporates. The researcher rejects the inference from mechanism to falsity: a causal etiology underdetermines veridicality. Newberg's own caution is apposite: neural correlates of "unitary states" show how experiences occur, not whether they are veridical (81). The responsibility condition here is mechanism-awareness: communities must know the psychological and neurocognitive profiles of their practices and specify training regimes that minimize known illusion-producers (sleep deprivation, hyperventilation, suggestibility). Mechanistic transparency strengthens, not weakens, credibility.

3.4.2. Objection 2. Peer disagreement and pluralism:

Reasonable, spiritually competent "peers" disagree across traditions; shouldn't this mandate doxastic suspension? The researcher adopts a conciliationist-but-graded stance: deep peer disagreement limits the scope of claims and enforces humility, but does not erase warrant where the multi-criteria cluster—coherence, reliability-in-practice, intersubjective calibration, defeat management, transformative fruits—is jointly satisfied (82). Swinburne's parity insight still holds: we trust appearances and testimony *ceteris paribus*, but in religion the *ceteris paribus* clause is thick and must include cross-traditional calibration and responsiveness to defeaters (83). Where two traditions each meet Robust Knowledge conditions, pluralist realism interprets the result as aspectual complementarity rather than stalemate.

3.4.3. Objection 3. Circularity of practice-based justification:

If a practice produces the beliefs that vindicate the practice, isn't justification viciously circular? The researcher distinguishes benign from vicious circularity. All higher-order practices (including sense perception) display some degree of feedback; the question is whether the circle is "virtuous"—open to disruption by defeaters, cross-checked by independent indicators (moral-intellectual fruits, stability across observers), and governed by virtues that penalize motivated reasoning (84). Responsibility condition: institutionalize external critique (inter-traditional dialogue, psychological screening, doctrinal review) to keep the circle permeable and truth-aimed.

3.4.3. Objection 4. Divine hiddenness and nonresistant nonbelief:

If the ultimate is truth-revealing, why do sincere seekers remain unconvinced? Schellenberg presses that persistent reasonable nonbelief undercuts claims of widely available warrant (85). The researcher replies with a dual-aspect norm: externalist entitlement may obtain for practitioners within a tradition's reliable practice; dialogical responsibility demands accessible reasons and fruits visible across communities. Responsibility condition: where putative disclosures are operative, one should observe durable patterns of moral-existential transformation and intellectual virtue that are hard to mimic by secular controls; otherwise, the warrant-claim is thin.

3.4.4. Objection 5. Moral-cognitive failure of mystics:

Historical cases of charismatic abuse and doctrinal antinomianism taint experiential claims. The researcher treats such failures as rebutting defeaters. On a virtue framework, intellectual humility, justice, and temperance are not optional adornments but reliability conditions. Responsibility condition: enforce characterological gatekeeping (formation, supervision, accountability structures) and trigger automatic suspension of credence when serious vice or abuse is substantiated. "Fruits" are not merely prudential outcomes; they are part of the evidential base.

3.4.6. Objection 6. Unverifiability:

"Mystical knowledge" seems insulated from public tests. The researcher distinguishes laboratory replicability from intersubjective calibrability. The latter is available: standardized taxonomies, convergent phenomenological markers among independent practitioners, longitudinal stability, and responsiveness to correction.

Ernest Sosa's insight is pertinent: knowledge requires an apt performance—success through ability in an appropriate environment. Responsibility condition: demonstrate aptness by showing that trained procedures reliably produce cognitions that survive serious objections and yield the practices' avowed soteriological goods. Conclusion—Responsibility architecture: The researcher proposes an accountability architecture:

- 1) codified defeat-conditions.
- 2) mechanism-awareness and error-minimization.
- 3) institutionalized external critique.
- 4) virtue cultivation with enforcement;
- 5) transparent record of revisions and failures.
- 6) calibrated public reasons and fruits.

Under these conditions, mystical cognition can justifiably rise from Qualified Warrant to Robust Knowledge. Without them, it remains, at best, minimally credible.

Chapter IV Conclusion:

This chapter has transposed mystical cognition from the precincts of compelling subjectivity into a disciplined epistemic space, specifying when and how it can count as knowledge. The graded model advances a stringent pathway: from Minimal Credibility through Qualified Warrant to Robust Knowledge, governed by conjunctive criteria—coherence, reliability-in-practice, intersubjective calibration, explicit defeat-management, and durable transformative fruits—under the regulation of intellectual virtues.

The researcher's closing judgment is unambiguous: mystical knowledge is possible and sometimes actual, but only where practices are truth-aimed, transparent, and corrigible, and where agents and institutions display humility, conscientiousness, and courage in the face of defeaters.

Pluralist realism survives scrutiny, not by draining ultimacy of content, but by acknowledging parameterized disclosures of an inexhaustible real—personal presence, nondual identity, emptiness—each verifiable within robust, virtue-formed practices and dialogically credible across traditions. Objections from naturalism, peer disagreement, circularity, hiddenness, and moral failure do not nullify this verdict; they constitute design constraints that the responsibility architecture explicitly incorporates. In effect, the chapter reframes “ineffability” as not a warrant-eclipsing fog but a boundary condition for disciplined knowing. Where the criteria are met and virtues enacted, the passage from experience to knowledge is not a leap of credulity but a measured ascent: fallible, defeasible, and yet epistemically proportionate to what the best mystical traditions dare to claim.

Conclusion:

Findings and Contributions:

1. Principal Theoretical Result:

The study establishes a graded model of spiritual epistemology—Minimal Credibility, Qualified Warrant, Robust Knowledge—that specifies when mystical disclosures can justifiably count as knowledge. The researcher finds that only a conjunctive cluster of criteria—coherence with a well-ordered web of belief, reliability within disciplined doxastic practices, intersubjective calibration, explicit defeat-management, and durable transformative fruits—under virtue-epistemic regulation elevates experiences from compelling subjectivity to defensible knowledge.

2. Epistemic Reframing of Mysticism:

The research demonstrates that ineffability and mediation are not defeaters but parameters. Ineffability marks non-propositional acquaintance that can yield constrained propositional consequences under disciplined hermeneutics. Mediation, far from entailing relativism, functions like theory-ladenness in science: it necessitates methodological controls rather than skepticism. The researcher maintains that calibrated method outperforms both naïve immediatism and global constructivism.

3. Comparative Validation:

Cross-traditional case studies—Sufi kashf and yaqīn, Christian apophatic theōria under ecclesial testing, Advaitin aparokṣa-jñāna and Madhyamaka prajñā—confirm that robust traditions already embody the proposed criteria: they codify practices, enforce discernment, articulate defeat conditions, and anchor claims in long-range moral-intellectual transformation. The researcher concludes that multiple traditions achieve Genuine, though defeasible, knowledge within their own grammars.

4. Pluralist Realism:

Convergences in phenomenology (e.g., de-reification, humility, compassion) and disciplined divergences in metaphysics (personal presence, nondual identity, emptiness) support a pluralist realism. The researcher argues for parameterized disclosure: one inexhaustible reality becomes knowable under distinct, norm-

governed modes of acquaintance, yielding aspectual truths that are non-collapsible yet mutually intelligible.

5. **Responsibility Architecture:**

The study codifies responsibility conditions for mystical cognition: explicit defeat protocols, mechanism-awareness and error-minimization, institutionally embedded external critique, characterological gatekeeping and virtue formation, and transparent records of correction. The researcher affirms that such architecture transforms skepticism's objections into design constraints that enhance, rather than erode, epistemic credibility.

6. **Reassessment of Classic Theories:**

Perceptual analogies (James–Alston) are vindicated when relocated from atomized episodes to reliable practices; reformed epistemology (Plantinga) is retained but disciplined by explicit defeat-management and cross-traditional portability; constructivist and neurocognitive critiques are integrated as necessary correctives without carrying reductive veto power.

7. **Normative Payoff:**

The findings reposition spiritual knowledge in philosophy: not an epistemic anomaly but a fallible, regulable, and sometimes robust mode of cognition. The researcher emphasizes that where criteria are met and virtues enacted, assent is not credulity but proportionate trust; where they are not, suspension or revision is rationally mandated.

8. **Practical Implications:**

For theology and spiritual formation, the model grounds discernment, oversight, and pedagogy in transparent epistemic norms. For interreligious dialogue, it supplies a common evaluative grammar that honors difference without dissolving normativity. For cognitive science and philosophy of mind, it frames testable hypotheses about reliability, transformation, and attention training.

In sum, the study's results vindicate a fallibilist, realist spiritual epistemology: mystical knowledge is possible and sometimes actual, provided it is earned through disciplined practices, governed by virtues, stress-tested comparatively, and kept corrigible by articulated defeat-conditions.

References for the Introduction:

1. Abū Ḥamid al-Ghazālī, *Deliverance from Error (al-Munqidh min al-Ḥalāl)*, trans. R. J. McCarthy (Louisville, KY: Fons Vitae, 2000); Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn ʿArabī, *The Meccan Openings (al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyya)*, selections trans. William C. Chittick (New York: SUNY Press, 1989); Teresa of Ávila, *The Interior Castle*, trans. E. Allison Peers (New York: Doubleday, 1961); 67.
2. Abū Ḥamid al-Ghazālī, *Deliverance from Error*, trans. R. J. McCarthy (Louisville, KY: Fons Vitae, 2000), pp. 63–70.
3. Abū'l-Qāsim al-Qushayrī, *Al-Qushayri's Epistle on Sufism (al-Risāla al-Qushayriyya)*, trans. Alexander D. Knysh (Reading, UK: Garnet Publishing, 2007), pp. 35–44, 246–255.
4. Alasdair MacIntyre, *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988), pp. 7–12, 354–369.
5. Alvin Plantinga, "Reason and Belief in God," in *Faith and Rationality: Reason and Belief in God*, ed. Alvin Plantinga and Nicholas Wolterstorff (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983), pp. 16–48.
6. Alvin Plantinga, *Warrant and Proper Function* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 3–14, 194–200.
7. Alvin Plantinga, *Warranted Christian Belief* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), chs. 6–9.
8. Alvin Plantinga, *Warranted Christian Belief* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 168–186, 352–356.
9. Alvin Plantinga, *Warranted Christian Belief* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 170–186, 244–258.
10. Alvin Plantinga, *Warranted Christian Belief* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 168–186.
11. Anantanand Rambachan, *The Advaita Worldview: God, World, and Humanity* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2006), pp. 41–58.
12. Andrew Newberg and Eugene d'Aquili, *The Mystical Mind: Probing the Biology of Religious Experience* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), pp. 113–135.
13. Andrew Newberg and Eugene d'Aquili, *The Mystical Mind: Probing the Biology of Religious Experience* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), pp. 136–145.
14. Ann Taves, *Religious Experience Reconsidered* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009), pp. 13–21.
15. Ann Taves, *Religious Experience Reconsidered: A Building-Block Approach to the Study of Religion and Other Special Things* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009).
16. Ann Taves, *Religious Experience Reconsidered: A Building-Block Approach to the Study of Religion and Other Special Things* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009).
17. Ann Taves, *Religious Experience Reconsidered: A Building-Block Approach to the Study of Religion and Other Special Things* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009), pp. 13–21.

SPIRITUAL EPISTEMOLOGY: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE THEORIES IN GLOBAL MYSTICAL TRADITIONS

By D^R. Zakaria GHOBIRINI

18. Ann Taves, *Religious Experience Reconsidered: A Building-Block Approach to the Study of Religion and Other Special Things* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009), pp. 13–21.
19. Ann Taves, *Religious Experience Reconsidered: A Building-Block Approach to the Study of Religion and Other Special Things* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009), pp. 13–21.
20. Chandrakīrti, *Introduction to the Middle Way: Ārya-Madhyamakāvatāra*, trans. The Padmakara Translation Group (Boston: Shambhala, 2002), pp. 120–135.
21. Denys Turner, *The Darkness of God: Negativity in Christian Mysticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 19–35.
22. Edmund Husserl, *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy*, trans. F. Kersten (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1983), pp. 33–36.
23. Ernest Sosa, *Knowing Full Well* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011), pp. 1–20.
24. Evan Thompson, *Waking, Dreaming, Being: Self and Consciousness in Neuroscience, Meditation, and Philosophy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015), pp. 317–332.
25. Francis X. Clooney, *Comparative Theology: Deep Learning Across Religious Borders* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), pp. 10–22.
26. Gregory Palamas, *The Triads*, trans. John Meyendorff and Nicholas Gendle (New York: Paulist Press, 1983), pp. 31–36, 67–75.
27. Henry Corbin, *Alone with the Alone: Creative Imagination in the Sūfism of Ibn ʿArabī* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969); Richard K. Payne, ed., *Tantric Buddhism in East Asia* (Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications, 2006) [for comparative method]; and Alston, *Perceiving God*, ch. 7.
28. Henry Corbin, *Alone with the Alone: Creative Imagination in the Sūfism of Ibn ʿArabī*, trans. R. Manheim (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969), pp. 171–176.
29. Hilary Putnam, *Reason, Truth and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 49–50, 123–125.
30. Ignatius of Loyola, *The Spiritual Exercises*, trans. George E. Ganss (Chicago: Loyola Press, 1992), “Rules for the Discernment of Spirits,” pp. 110–126.
31. J. L. Schellenberg, *Divine Hiddenness and Human Reason* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), pp. 1–20, 83–102.
32. J. L. Schellenberg, *Divine Hiddenness and Human Reason* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), pp. 204–214.
33. Jean-Luc Marion, *In Excess: Studies of Saturated Phenomena*, trans. Robyn Horner and Vincent Berraud (New York: Fordham University Press, 2002); Edith Stein, *On the Problem of Empathy*, trans. Waltraut Stein (Washington, DC: ICS Publications, 1989).
34. Jean-Luc Marion, *In Excess: Studies of Saturated Phenomena*, trans. Robyn Horner and Vincent Berraud (New York: Fordham University Press, 2002).
35. John Greco, *Achieving Knowledge: A Virtue-Theoretic Account of Epistemic Normativity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 5–9, 70–85.
36. John Hick, *An Interpretation of Religion: Human Responses to the Transcendent*, 2nd ed. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004).

SPIRITUAL EPISTEMOLOGY: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE THEORIES IN GLOBAL MYSTICAL TRADITIONS

By D^R. Zakaria GHOBINI

37. John Hick, *An Interpretation of Religion: Human Responses to the Transcendent*, 2nd ed. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004), pp. 240–259.
38. John of the Cross, *Dark Night of the Soul*, trans. E. Allison Peers (New York: Doubleday, 1959), Book II, pp. 85–98.
39. Justin L. Barrett, *Why Would Anyone Believe in God?* (Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press, 2004), pp. 13–31, 97–104.
40. Linda Trinkaus Zagzebski, *Virtues of the Mind* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), chs. 1–3; Robert C. Roberts and W. Jay Wood, *Intellectual Virtues: An Essay in Regulative Epistemology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
41. Linda Trinkaus Zagzebski, *Virtues of the Mind* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
42. Linda Trinkaus Zagzebski, *Virtues of the Mind* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 9–23.
43. Linda Trinkaus Zagzebski, *Virtues of the Mind* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 9–23.
44. Linda Trinkaus Zagzebski, *Virtues of the Mind* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 9–23.
45. Linda Trinkaus Zagzebski, *Virtues of the Mind* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 9–23.
46. Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. Colin Smith (London: Routledge, 1962), pp. vii–xviii.
47. Michael Bergmann, *Justification Without Awareness: A Defense of Epistemic Externalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 154–166.
48. Michael Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), 266–71.
49. Michel Chodkiewicz, *Seal of the Saints: Prophethood and Sainthood in the Doctrine of Ibn ‘Arabi*, trans. Liadain Sherrard (Cambridge: Islamic Texts Society, 1993), pp. 1–10.
50. Nāgārjuna, *The Fundamental Wisdom of the Middle Way: Nāgārjuna’s Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, trans. Jay L. Garfield (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), ch. 24, pp. 291–306.
51. Paul Ricoeur, *The Symbolism of Evil*, trans. Emerson Buchanan (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), p. 347.
52. Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Complete Works*, trans. Colm Luibheid (New York: Paulist Press, 1987), “The Mystical Theology,” pp. 135–142.
53. Ralph W. Hood Jr., “The Construction and Preliminary Validation of a Measure of Reported Mystical Experience,” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 14, no. 1 (1975): pp. 29–41.
54. Richard Swinburne, *Faith and Reason*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 70–79.
55. Richard Swinburne, *Faith and Reason*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 70–85.

SPIRITUAL EPISTEMOLOGY: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE THEORIES IN GLOBAL MYSTICAL TRADITIONS

By D^R. Zakaria GHOBINI

56. Richard Swinburne, *The Existence of God*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004), pp. 303–312; and *Faith and Reason*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 70–79.
57. Robert C. Roberts and W. Jay Wood, *Intellectual Virtues: An Essay in Regulative Epistemology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 27–41.
58. Robert C. Roberts and W. Jay Wood, *Intellectual Virtues: An Essay in Regulative Epistemology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 27–41.
59. Robert C. Roberts and W. Jay Wood, *Intellectual Virtues: An Essay in Regulative Epistemology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 189–200.
60. Robert H. Sharf, “Buddhist Modernism and the Rhetoric of Meditative Experience,” *Numen* 42, no. 3 (1995): pp. 228–229, 263–266.
61. Robert K. C. Forman, *Mysticism, Mind, Consciousness* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1999), pp. 39–45.
62. S. Mark Heim, *Salvations: Truth and Difference in Religion* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), pp. 8–15, 147–160.
63. Śaṅkara, *Brahma-Sūtra-Bhāṣya*, trans. Swami Gambhirananda (Kolkata: Advaita Ashrama, 1998), pp. 1–12.
64. Śaṅkara, *Upadeśa Sāhasrī (A Thousand Teachings)*, trans. Swami Jagadananda (Chennai: Sri Ramakrishna Math, 2000), pp. 39–58.
65. Sarah Coakley, *God, Sexuality, and the Self: An Essay ‘On the Trinity’* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 45–60.
66. Steven T. Katz, “Language, Epistemology, and Mysticism,” in *Mysticism and Philosophical Analysis*, ed. Steven T. Katz (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), pp. 26–27.
67. Steven T. Katz, “Language, Epistemology, and Mysticism,” in *Mysticism and Philosophical Analysis*, ed. Steven T. Katz (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 22–74.
68. Steven T. Katz, “Language, Epistemology, and Mysticism,” in *Mysticism and Philosophical Analysis*, ed. Steven T. Katz (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 22–74.
69. Steven T. Katz, “Language, Epistemology, and Mysticism,” in *Mysticism and Philosophical Analysis*, ed. Steven T. Katz (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 26.
70. Teresa of Ávila, *The Interior Castle*, trans. E. Allison Peers (New York: Doubleday, 1961), *Fourth Mansions*, pp. 199–205.
71. Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), pp. 103–110, 176–191.
72. William C. Chittick, *The Self-Disclosure of God: Principles of Ibn al-‘Arabi’s Cosmology* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998), pp. 8–15.
73. William C. Chittick, *The Sufi Path of Knowledge: Ibn al-‘Arabi’s Metaphysics of Imagination* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1989), pp. 3–6, 120–128.
74. William J. Wainwright, *Mysticism: A Study of its Nature, Cognitive Value, and Moral Implications* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1981), pp. 223–237.
75. William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1902), *Lecture XVI*, pp. 371–390.
76. William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1902), *Lectures XVI–XVII*, pp. 271

**SPIRITUAL EPISTEMOLOGY: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE
THEORIES IN GLOBAL MYSTICAL TRADITIONS**

By D^R. Zakaria GHOBINI

77. William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1902), Lectures XVI–XVII. pp. 31
78. William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1902), Lecture XVI, pp. 371–381.
79. William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1902), Lecture XVI, pp. 371–390.
80. William P. Alston, *Perceiving God: The Epistemology of Religious Experience* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991), esp. chs. 1–3; Alvin Plantinga, *Warranted Christian Belief* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), chs. 6–9.
81. William P. Alston, *Perceiving God: The Epistemology of Religious Experience* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991).
82. William P. Alston, *Perceiving God: The Epistemology of Religious Experience* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991), pp. 34–41, 146–152.
83. William P. Alston, *Perceiving God: The Epistemology of Religious Experience* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991), pp. 34–41, 146–152.
84. William P. Alston, *Perceiving God: The Epistemology of Religious Experience* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991), pp. 100–107, 170–176.
85. William P. Alston, *Perceiving God: The Epistemology of Religious Experience* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991), pp. 100–107, 170–176.